arXiv:1106.5935v1 [math.NT] 29 Jun 2011

ON EQUATION $x^q = a$ OVER $\mathbb{Q}_p$

FARRUKH MUKHAMEDOV AND MANSOOR SABUROV

Abstract. In this paper we provide a solvability criteria for the equation $x^q = a$ over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ for any natural number q. We fix some mistakes in the proofs of the results given in [4] and generalize those results. As an application of our results, we describe a relationship between q and p in which the number -1 is the q-th power of some $p-$adic number.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 11Sxx
Key words: Solvability criteria; $p-$adic numbers; equation.

1. Introduction

Over the last century, $p-$adic numbers and $p-$adic analysis have come to play a central role in modern number theory. This importance comes from the fact that they afford a natural and powerful language for talking about congruences between integers, and allow the use of methods borrowed from analysis for studying such problems.

The fields of $p-$adic numbers were introduced by German mathematician K. Hensel [7]. The $p-$adic numbers were motivated primarily by an attempt to bring the ideas and techniques of power series methods into number theory. Their canonical representation is analogous to the expansion of analytic functions into power series. This is one of the manifestations of the analogy between algebraic numbers and algebraic functions.

For a fixed prime p, by $\mathbb{Q}_p$ it is denoted the field of $p-$adic numbers, which is a completion of the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to the non-Archimedean norm $|\cdot|_p : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$|x|_p = \begin{cases} p^{-r} & x \neq 0, \\ 0, & x = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

here, $x = p^r \frac{m}{n}$ with $r, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(m,p) = (n,p) = 1$. A number r is called *a $p-$order* of x and it is denoted by $ord_p(x) = r$.

Any $p-$adic number $x \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ can be uniquely represented in the following canonical form

$$x = p^{ord_p(x)} \left(x_0 + x_1 \cdot p + x_2 \cdot p^2 + \cdots \right)$$

where $x_0 \in \{1, 2, \cdots p-1\}$ and $x_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots p-1\}$, $i \geq 1$, (see [3], [11])

More recently, numerous applications of $p-$adic numbers have shown up in theoretical physics and quantum mechanics (see for example, [1], [2], [6], [8, 9], [12]-[16],[18, 19]).

The $p-$adic numbers are connected with solutions of Diophantine equations modulo increasing powers of a prime number. The study of Diophantine equations is finding solutions of polynomial equations or systems of equations in integers, rational numbers, or sometimes more general number rings. Such a topic is one of the oldest branches of number theory, in fact of mathematics itself. The theory of Diophantine equations in number rings was well developed in [3], [5].

Surprisingly, up to now, there is not any solvability criterion for the following simple equation

$$x^q = a \tag{1.2}$$

over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q > 2$, $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. Recently, J.M. Casas et.al. [4] have attempted to provide a solvability criterion for the equation (1.2) concerning with classification problems of high order Leibnitz algebras (see [10]). They provided a criterion in the explicit form for two cases (i) $(q, p) = 1$, (ii) $q = p$, and it was stated that the solvability problem for $q = m \cdot p^s$ can be reduced to the cases (i) or (ii).

However, in [4] there is a serious mistakes in their proofs for the cases (i) and (ii), moreover, the provided algorithm for $q = m \cdot p^s$ does not properly work. Let us briefly explain their mistakes. Suppose a, b are two $p-$adic numbers of the form

$$a = a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + a_2 \cdot p^2 + \cdots , \qquad b = b_0 + b_1 \cdot p + b_2 \cdot p^2 + \cdots ,$$

here a_i, b_i are any integer numbers with $a_0, b_0 \neq 0$. It was stated in [4] that if $a = b$ then $a_i = b_i \ (mod\ p)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and reverse versus if $a_i = b_i \ (mod\ p)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ then $a = b$. This is obviously wrong! Now we provide simple counter examples.

Let us first consider the following two expansions of the number $-\frac{1}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + 3 + 3^2 + 3^3 + 3^4 + 3^5 + \cdots = \frac{1}{1-3} &= -\frac{1}{2}, \\ 4 + 4 \cdot 3^2 + 4 \cdot 3^4 + 4 \cdot 3^6 + \cdots = 4 \cdot \frac{1}{1-3^2} &= -\frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then one has $a_i = 1$ for any $i \geq 0$ in the first expansion, and $b_{2i} = 4$, $b_{2i+1} = 0$ for any $i \geq 0$ in the second expansion. However, $a_{2i+1} \neq b_{2i+1} \ (mod\ 3)$ for any $i \geq 0$. This shows that the equality $a = b$ does not yield the relationship $a_i = b_i \ (mod\ p)$ except $i = 0$.

Now we consider the following numbers

$$\begin{aligned} a &= 1 + 3 + 3^2 + 3^3 + 3^4 + 3^5 + \cdots \\ b &= 4 + 4 \cdot 3 + 4 \cdot 3^2 + 4 \cdot 3^3 + 4 \cdot 3^4 + 4 \cdot 3^5 + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

then we have that $a_i = 1 = 4 = b_i \ (mod\ p)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. However, $a = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $b = -2$ which means $a \neq b$. This shows that the relationship $a_i = b_i \ (mod\ p)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ does not yield the equality $a = b$.

Unexpectedly, in [18], the same type mistake was happened in the proof of the solvability criterion for the equation (1.2) with $q = 2$. However, there are many rigorous proofs of those results in [3], [11].

Let us turn the case $q = m \cdot p^s$ with $(m, p) = 1$, $s \geq 1$. In this case, as it was mentioned in [4], the solvability problem can be reduced to the cases (i) or (ii) as follows: if one denotes by $y = x^{p^s}$ then the solvability of the equation (1.2) is an equivalent to the solvability of the equation $y^m = a$. This is the equation considered in case (i). Assume for the last equation the solvability condition is satisfied and its solution is $y = \tilde{y}$. Then one has to solve the equation $x^{p^s} = \tilde{y}$ or $z^p = \tilde{y}$ here

$z = x^{p^{s-1}}$. The last equation is the equation considered in case (ii). Suppose for the last equation the solvability condition is satisfied and its solution is $z = \tilde{z}$. Then one obtains $x^{p^{s-1}} = \tilde{z}$ which again can be reduced to the case (ii). After iterating the last argument s times one can get solvability criterion for the equation (1.2) as a system of conditions of cases (i) and (ii).

The disadvantage of this algorithm which we want to emphasize it is that the criterion only says about an existence of a solution of the equation (1.2). However, the criterion does not tell about what is the solution. Therefor, the algorithm mentioned above does not tell about the solution $\tilde{y}$ which was obtained after the first step. In the next step, we could not apply the criterion for the equation $z^p = \tilde{y}$ because we do not know about $\tilde{y}$. Hence, the algorithm does not properly work in the case $q = m \cdot p^s$. We stress that the purpose of the solvability criterion is that one should know an existence of solution of the equation (1.2) based on a. But the algorithm does not tell any information about an existence of a solution while a was given.

It is worth to mention that statements of the solvability criteria given in [4] were correct for the cases $(q, p) = 1$ and $q = p$. In this paper, we want to show it by presenting rigorous and accurate proofs. More precisely, we provide the solvability criteria in an explicit form for $(q, p) = 1$ and $q = p$ as well as for $q = m \cdot p^s$. Note that our proofs are totally different from [4]. As it is usual, since the nature of $\mathbb{Q}_2$ is different form the nature of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ with $p > 2$, the solvability criterion of the equation (1.2) in $\mathbb{Q}_2$ is different from the criterion of (1.2) in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. We shall study them separately. As an application of our results, we describe the relationship between q and p in which the number -1 is the q-th power of some $p-$adic number.

2. Preliminaries

First recall that

$$\mathbb{Z}_p = \{x \in \mathbb{Q}_p : |x|_p \leq 1\}, \quad \mathbb{Z}_p^* = \{x \in \mathbb{Q}_p : |x|_p = 1\}$$

are the set of all $p-$*adic integers* and *units* of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, respectively.

Any element $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ has the following unique canonical form

$$x = x_0 + x_1 \cdot p + x_2 \cdot p^2 + \cdots$$

where $x_0 \in \{1, 2, \cdots p-1\}$ and $x_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots p-1\}$, $i \geq 1$.

The following fact is well-known.

Proposition 2.1 ([3])**.** *Any $p-$adic number x has a unique representation of the form $x = p^{ord_p(x)} x_*$, where $x_* \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.*

We want to solve the following equation in the $p-$adic field $\mathbb{Q}_p$

$$x^q = a, \tag{2.1}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. The $p-$adic numbers x, a have the the following unique form

$$x = p^{ord_p(x)} x_*, \quad a = p^{ord_p(a)} a_*.$$

Then after substituting these forms into (2.1) we get

$$p^{q \cdot ord_p(x)} x_*^q = p^{ord_p(a)} a_*$$

Then, one can see that the equation (2.1) has a solution if and only if

(i) q divides $ord_p(a)$;
(ii) The equation $x_*^q = a_*$ has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ whenever $a_* \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

Therefore, it is enough to solve the equation (2.1) over $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ whenever $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Therefore, in what follows, we shall provide a solvability criterion for the equation (2.1) in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ whenever $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

The main idea to find such a criterion for (2.1) over $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$, is to apply Hensel's Lemma in a suitable form for (2.1). Let us recall

Lemma 2.2 (Hensel's Lemma, [3])**.** *Let $f(x)$ be polynomial whose the coefficients are $p-$adic integers. Let θ be a $p-$adic integer such that for some $i \geq 0$ we have*

$$f(\theta) \equiv 0 \ (mod \ p^{2i+1}),$$

$$f'(\theta) \equiv 0 \ (mod \ p^{i}), \quad f'(\theta) \not\equiv 0 \ (mod \ p^{i+1}).$$

Then the polynomial $f(x)$ has a $p-$adic integer root x_0 with $x_0 \equiv \theta \ (mod \ p^{i+1})$.

3. Auxiliary results

In this section we are going to provide some auxiliary results which will be used in the forthcoming sections. However, they are independent of interest.

Throughout this paper, we call integer numbers as *rational integers* in order to differentiate them from $p-$adic integers.

Lemma 3.1. *Let p be any prime number, $q = p^s$, $s \geq 1$, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. If the equation*

$$x^q \equiv a \ (mod \ p^{k+1}) \tag{3.1}$$

has a rational integer solution for some $k = k_0$ then it has a rational integer solution for any $k \geq k_0$. Here $k_0 \geq s+1$ whenever $p = 2$. and $k_0 \geq s$ whenever $p > 2$.

Proof. Let p be any prime number, $q = p^s$, $s \geq 1$, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. We apply mathematical induction with respect to k where $k \geq k_0$. Due to the assertion of the lemma, the equation (3.1) has a rational integer solution for $k = k_0$. Assume that (3.1) has a solution $x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $k = n$, where $n \geq k_0$. Now we want to show that $x_{n+1} = x_n + \varepsilon p^{n-s+1}$ is a solution of (3.1) for $k = n+1$, where

$$\varepsilon = a_{n+1} - \frac{x_n^q - a_0 - a_1 \cdot p - \cdots - a_n \cdot p^n}{p^{n+1}}.$$

It is worth to mention that $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}$, because x_n is a solution of (3.1) for $k = n$. It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1}^q &= x_n^q + q x_n^{q-1}\varepsilon \cdot p^{n-s+1} + \frac{q(q-1)}{2} x_n^{q-2}\varepsilon^2 \cdot p^{2(n-s+1)} + \cdots \\ &= x_n^q + x_n^{q-1}\varepsilon \cdot p^{n+1} + \frac{q-1}{2} x_n^{q-2}\varepsilon^2 \cdot p^{2n-s+2} + \cdots . \end{aligned}$$

If $p > 2$ then $n \geq s$, $\frac{q-1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $2n - s + 2 \geq n + 2$. If $p = 2$ then $n \geq s+1$ and $2n - s + 2 \geq n + 3$. In both cases, one has

$$\frac{q-1}{2} x_n^{q-2}\varepsilon^2 \cdot p^{2n-s+2} + \cdots \equiv 0 \ (mod \ p^{n+2}).$$

Therefore, for any prime p, one finds

$$x_{n+1}^q \equiv x_n^q + x_n^{q-1}\varepsilon \cdot p^{n+1} \ (mod\ p^{n+2}).$$

We know that $(x_n, p) = 1$ since $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Then one has $x_n^{q-1} \equiv 1\ (mod\ p)$ since $x_n^{p-1} \equiv 1\ (mod\ p)$ and $q = p^s$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1}^q &\equiv x_n^q + x_n^{q-1}\varepsilon \cdot p^{n+1} \equiv x_n^q + p^{n+1}\varepsilon \ (mod\ p^{n+2}) \\ &\equiv a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_{n+1} \cdot p^{n+1} \ (mod\ p^{n+2}) \\ &\equiv a \ (mod\ p^{n+2}). \end{aligned}$$

This means that x_{n+1} is a solution of (3.1) for $k = n + 1$. This completes the proof. □

4. The criterion for the existence of a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ with $p > 2$

In this section we are going to provide a correct proof of a criterion for the existence of a solution of (2.1) over $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ when p is an odd prime number. In the sequel, we shall suppose that $q \geq 2$, otherwise nothing to do with the equation (2.1).

Recall that a rational integer a is called *a q-th power residue modulo p* if the congruence equation $x^q \equiv a\ (mod\ p)$ has a rational integer solution.

Theorem 4.1. *Let q be any natural number, p be an odd prime number, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. The following statements hold true:*

(i) *If $(q, p) = 1$ then the equation (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ if and only if a_0 is the q-th power residue modulo p.*

(ii) *If $q = p^s$, $s \geq 1$ then the equation (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ if and only if $a_0^q \equiv a\ (mod\ p^{s+1})$, i.e.,*

$$a_0^q \equiv \ a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \ (mod\ p^{s+1}).$$

Moreover, for any solution x of (2.1) one has that $x \equiv a\ (mod\ p)$.

(iii) *If $q = m \cdot p^s$ with $(m, p) = 1$, $s \geq 1$ then the equation (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ if and only if a_0 is the m-th power residue modulo p and $a_0^q \equiv a\ (mod\ p^{s+1})$, i.e.,*

$$a_0^q \equiv \ a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \ (mod\ p^{s+1}).$$

Proof. Let q be any natural number, p be an odd prime number, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Then there are three possibilities for the numbers p and q: (i) $(q, p) = 1$, (ii) $q = p^s$ with $s \geq 1$, (iii) $q = m \cdot p^s$ with $(m, p) = 1$ and $s \geq 1$.

(i). Let $(p, q) = 1$.

Only If Part. Suppose that the equation (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Then it is clear that

$$x^q = x_0^q + q x_0^{q-1} x_1 \cdot p + \cdots = a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots = a.$$

This yields that $x_0^q \equiv a_0\ (mod\ p)$, i.e., a_0 is the q-th power residue modulo p.

If Part. Suppose that a_0 is the q-th power residue modulo p, i.e., there is x_0 such that $x_0^q \equiv a_0\ (mod\ p)$. We want to show that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. To this end, let us consider the following function

$$f_q(x) = x^q - a. \tag{4.1}$$

Then, it is clear that

$$f_p(x_0) = x_0^q - a \equiv a_0 - a \equiv 0 \ (mod\ p).$$

On the other hand, since $(q,p) = 1$ and $(x_0,p) = 1$, we get

$$f_q'(x_0) = qx_0^{q-1} \neq 0 \ (mod\ p).$$

Therefore, due to Hensel's Lemma 2.2, we can conclude that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Since $x^q = a$ and $\|a\|_p = 1$ for such a solution $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, one has $\|x\|_p = \sqrt[q]{\|a\|_q} = 1$. It means that x belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

(ii). Let $q = p^s$ with $s \geq 1$.

Only If Part. Suppose that (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. Then, it is clear that

$$x^q = x_0^q + x_0^{q-1}x_1 \cdot p^{s+1} + p^{s+2}\left(\frac{q-1}{2}x_0^{q-2}x_1^2 + \cdots\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Here, we used the fact that $\frac{q-1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ because of $p > 2$.

Therefore, one gets

$$x_0^q + x_0^{q-1}x_1 \cdot p^{s+1} + \cdots = a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s + a_{s+1} \cdot p^{s+1} + \cdots \tag{4.3}$$

This yields that $x_0^q = x_0^{p^s} \equiv a_0 \ (mod\ p)$. On the other hand, due to Fermat's little theorem, we have $x_0^p \equiv x_0 \ (mod\ p)$. Then it follows that $a_0 \equiv x_0^q \equiv x_0 \ (mod\ p)$. We know that $x_0, a_0 \in \{1, 2, \cdots p-1\}$, therefore $x_0 = a_0$.

It follows again from (4.3) that

$$x_0^q \equiv a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \ (mod\ p^{s+1}).$$

Taking into account $x_0 = a_0$, we obtain

$$a_0^q \equiv a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \ (mod\ p^{s+1}).$$

It is worth to mention that for any solution $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ one has $x = a \ (mod\ p)$, because of $x_0 = a_0$. In other words, the first digit of any solution x of (2.1) is the same with the first digit of a.

If Part. Suppose that

$$a_0^q \equiv a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \ (mod\ p^{s+1}). \tag{4.4}$$

We want to show that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. In fact, let us consider the function f_q (see (4.1)).

Due to (4.4), a_0 is a rational integer solution of (3.1) when $k = s$. Then according to Lemma 3.1, there is $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$x_0^q \equiv a \ (mod\ p^{2s+1}). \tag{4.5}$$

Then we obtain

$$f_q(x_0) \equiv 0 \ (mod\ p^{2s+1}).$$

It follows from (4.5) that $x_0^q \equiv a_0 \ (mod\ p)$ which means that $(x_0,p) = 1$. We then have

$$f_q'(x_0) = qx_0^{q-1} = p^s x_0^{q-1} \equiv 0 \ (mod\ p^s),$$

$$f_q'(x_0) = qx_0^{q-1} = p^s x_0^{q-1} \neq 0 \ (mod\ p^{s+1}).$$

Therefore, due to Hensel's Lemma 2.2 we conclude that (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. From $\|a\|_p = 1$, we infer that x belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$.

(iii) Let $q = m \cdot p^s$ with $(m, p) = 1$ and $s \geq 1$.

ONLY IF PART. Suppose that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$, i.e., there is $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ such that

$$x^q = x^{m \cdot p^s} = \left(x^{p^s}\right)^m = (x^m)^{p^s} = a.$$

This means that $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ is the m-th as well as the p^s-th power of some $p-$adic integer numbers. Then due to the cases (i) and (ii), we have that a_0 is the m-th power residue modulo p and

$$a_0^q \equiv \; a_0 + a_1 \cdot p + \cdots + a_s \cdot p^s \; (mod\; p^{s+1}). \tag{4.6}$$

IF PART. Suppose that a_0 is the m-th power residue modulo p with the condition (4.6). Now we show that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$. In fact, due to the condition (4.6) and (ii), there is $y \in \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ such that $y^{p^s} = a$ and $y \equiv a \; (mod\; p)$. This yields that the first digit y_0 of the $p-$adic integer y is a_0. Therefore, y_0 is the m-th power residue modulo p. Then, due to (i), the $p-$adic integer y is m-th power of some $p-$adic integer x, i.e., $x^m = y$. Consequently, the $p-$adic integer a is q-th power of the $p-$adic integer x, i.e.,

$$a = y^{p^s} = (x^m)^{p^s} = x^{m \cdot p^s} = x^q.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

5. A CRITERION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF SOLUTION IN $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$

In this section we are going to provide a criterion for the existence of a solution of (2.1) in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$. The solvability criterion when $p = 2$ is slightly different form the case $p > 2$. Namely we have the following

Theorem 5.1. *Let q be any natural number and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. The following statements hold true:*

(i) *If q is an odd number then the equation* (2.1) *has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ for any a.*

(ii) *If $q = 2^s m$, where m is an odd number and $s \geq 1$ then the equation* (2.1) *has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ if and only if $a \equiv 1 \; (mod\; 2^{s+2})$, i.e.,*

$$a_0 = 1, \quad a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{s+1} = 0.$$

Proof. Let q be any natural number and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. Then q is either odd or $2^s m$, where m is an odd number and $s \geq 1$.

(i) Let q be an odd number. Let us show that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}_2^*$. In fact, let us consider the same function f_q as before (see (4.1)). Since $a \in \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ and $(q, 2) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_q(1) &= 1 - a \equiv 0 \; (mod\; 2), \\ f_q'(1) &= q \not\equiv 0 \; (mod\; 2). \end{aligned}$$

Due to Hensel's Lemma 2.2 we can conclude that (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and such a solution x should belong to $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$, because of $\|a\|_2 = 1$

(ii) We shall first consider the case $q = 2^s$ with $s \geq 1$. Suppose that (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$. Then it is clear that

$$x^q = x_0^q + x_0^{q-2} x_1 (x_0 + x_1(q-1)) \cdot 2^{s+1} + 2^{s+3} \left(\frac{(q-1)(q-2)}{6} x_0^{q-2} x_1^3 + \cdots \right).$$

This yields that $x_0^q \equiv 1 = a_0$ $(mod\ 2)$. Then $x_0 = 1$ and

$$x^q = 1 + x_1(1 + x_1(q-1)) \cdot 2^{s+1} + 2^{s+3} \left(\frac{(q-1)(q-2)}{6} x_0^{q-2} x_1^3 + \cdots \right).$$

Since $x_1(1+x_1(q-1)) \equiv 0 (mod\ 2)$, one gets $x^q \equiv 1 (mod\ 2^{s+2})$. Taking into account $x^q = a$, we heve $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$, i.e.,

$$a_0 = 1, \quad a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{s+1} = 0.$$

Let us show the converse implication. Suppose that $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$. Now we show that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ when $q = 2^s$.

In fact, again consider the function f_q. Then 1 is a rational integer solution of the equation (3.1) with $k = s+1$ and $p = 2$, since $1 \equiv a$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$. Then according to Lemma 3.1, there is $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$x_0^q \equiv a \ (mod\ 2^{2s+1}).$$

We then obtain $f_q(x_0) \equiv 0$ $(mod\ p^{2s+1})$. From $(x_0, 2) = 1$, it follows that

$$f_q'(x_0) = 2^s x_0^{q-1} \equiv 0 \ (mod\ 2^s), \quad f'(x_0) = 2^s x_0^{q-1} \not\equiv 0 \ (mod\ 2^{s+1}).$$

Again Hensel's Lemma 2.2 implies that (2.1) has a solution x in $\mathbb{Z}_2$, which is clearly belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$. Thus, in the case $q = 2^s$, the equation (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ if and only if $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$.

Let us turn to the general case $q = 2^s m$, where m is an odd number and $s \geq 1$. Suppose that (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$, i.e., there is $x \in \mathbb{Z}_2^*$ such that

$$x^q = (x^m)^{2^s} = a.$$

This means that a is 2^s-th power of some $2-$adic integer numbers. Then, as we showed, one has $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$.

Now we show the reverse implication, i.e., if $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$ then (2.1) has a solution in $\mathbb{Z}_2^*$ when $q = 2^s m$. It is clear that, since $a \equiv 1$ $(mod\ 2^{s+2})$, the $2-$adic integer a is 2^s-th power of some $2-$adic integer numbers y, i.e., $y^{2^s} = a$. According to the case (i), since m is odd, y is the m-th power of some $2-$adic integer x, i.e., $x^m = y$. Hence, a is the q-th power of the $2-$adic integer x. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1 □

6. WHEN IS -1 THE POWER OF SOME P-ADIC INTEGER

In this section, as an application of provided criteria, we are going to describe a relationship between p and q in which -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer. To this end, we need one auxiliary result from elementary number theory.

Proposition 6.1 ([17]). *Let p be a prime number, q be a natural number, and a be a rational integer number with $(a,p)=1$. Then a is a q-th power residue modulo p if and only if one has*

$$a^{\frac{p-1}{d}} \equiv 1 \ (mod\ p),$$

where $d=(q,p-1)$.

We are now ready to describe all p,q in which -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer.

Theorem 6.2. *Let q be a natural number with $q \geq 2$ and p be an odd prime number. The following statements hold true:*

- (i) *The number -1 is any odd power of some $2-$adic integer and the number -1 is not any even power of any $2-$adic integer;*
- (ii) *If $(q,p)=1$ then the number -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer if and only if $\frac{p-1}{(q,p-1)}$ is even;*
- (iii) *If $q=p^s$ with $s \geq 1$ then the number -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer;*
- (iv) *If $q=m \cdot p^s$ with $(m,p)=1$ and $s \geq 1$ then the number -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer if and only if $\frac{p-1}{(m,p-1)}$ is even.*

Proof. Let q be a natural number with $q \geq 2$ and p be an odd prime number. It is clear that -1 is $2-$adic as well as $p-$adic integer. One can see that -1 has a canonical form with $a_i = p-1$ for any $i=0,1,2,\cdots$ in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. The statement (i) is obvious.

(ii) Let $(q,p)=1$. According to Theorem 4.1, -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer if and only if $p-1$ is a q-th power residue modulo p. This is the same as -1 is a q-th power residue modulo p. Then, due to Proposition 6.1, -1 is a q-th power residue modulo p if and only if $\dfrac{p-1}{(q,p-1)}$ is even.

(iii) Let $q=p^s$ with $s \geq 1$. Again according to Theorem 4.1, -1 is a q-th power of some $p-$adic integer if and only if one has $(p-1)^q \equiv -1 \ (mod\ p^{s+1})$. This holds true for any p and s. Therefore, if $q=p^s$ then -1 is always q-th power of some $p-$adic integer.

The statement (iv) follows from Theorem 4.1 and previous statements (ii), (iii). This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgement

The present study have been done within the grant FRGS0409-109 of Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education. A part of this work was done at the Abdus Salam International Center for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Trieste, Italy. The author thanks the ICTP for providing financial support during his visit as a Junior Associate at the centre.

References

[1] L.Ya. Arafeva, B. Dragovich, P.H. Frampton, I.V. Volovich, Wave function of the universe and p-adic gravity, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* 6 (1991), 4341–4358.

[2] E. Beltrametti, G. Cassinelli, Quantum mechanics and p-adic numbers, *Found. Phys.,* **2** (1972), 1–7.

[3] Z. I. Borevich, I. R. Shafarevich, *Number Theory*, Acad. Press, New York, 1966.

[4] J.M. Casas, B.A.Omirov, U.A. Rozikov, Solvability criteria for the equation $x^q = a$ in the field of $p-$adic numbers, `arXiv:1102.2156`.

[5] H. Cohen, *Number Theory, Volume I: Tools and Diophantine Equations*, Springer, New York, 2007.

[6] P.G.O. Freund, E. Witten, Adelic string amplitudes, *Phys. Lett. B* **199** (1987), 191–194.

[7] K. Hensel, Untersuchung der Fundamentalgleichung einer Gattung fur eine reelle Primzahl als Modul und Bestimmung der Theiler ihrer Discriminante, *J. Reine Angew Math.*, **113** (1894), 61-83.

[8] A.Yu. Khrennikov, p-adic quantum mechanics with p-adic valued functions, *J. Math. Phys.* **32** (1991) 932–936.

[9] A. Yu. Khrennikov, *p-Adic Valued Distributions in Mathematical Physics*, Kluwer, Dordrecht 1994.

[10] A. Kh.Khudoyberdiyev, T.K.Kurbanbaev, B.A.Omirov, Classification of three-dimensional solvable p-adic Leibniz algebras, *P-Adic Numbers Ultrametric Anal. Appl.* **2**(2010) 207–221.

[11] N. Koblitz, *$p-$adic numbers, $p-$adic Analysis, and Zeta Functions*, Sipringer, New York , 1984.

[12] Yu. Manin, New dimensions in geometry, *Lect. Notes in Math.,* **1111** (1985), 59-101.

[13] E. Marinary, G. Parisi, On the p-adic five point function, *Phys. Lett.* **203** (1988) 52–56.

[14] A. Monna and F. van der Blij, Models of space and time in elementary physics, *J. Math. Anal. and Appl.,* **22** (1968) 537-545.

[15] F.M. Mukhamedov, U.A. Rozikov, On Gibbs measures of p-adic Potts model on Cayley tree. *Indag. Math. (N.S.),* **15** (2004) 85–100.

[16] F.M. Mukhamedov, U.A. Rozikov, On inhomogeneous p-adic Potts model on a Cayley tree. *Inf. Dim. Anal. Quant. Prob. Rel. Fields.* **8**(2005) 277–290.

[17] K.H. Rosen, *Elementary number theory and its applications*, Pearson 2011.

[18] V. S. Vladimirov, I. V. Volovich, I. Zelenov, *p-Adic Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, World Scientific, Singapore 1994.

[19] I.V. Volovich, p-adic strings, *Class. Quantum Gray.,* **4** (1987), 83–87.

Farrukh Mukhamedov, Department of Computational & Theoretical Sciences, Faculty of Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia, P.O. Box, 141, 25710, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia

E-mail address: `far75m@yandex.ru`

Mansoor Saburov, Department of Computational & Theoretical Sciences, Faculty of Science, International Islamic University Malaysia, P.O. Box, 141, 25710, Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia

E-mail address: `msaburov@gmail.com`